

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 were pending. Claims 1-32 were rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1-8, 12-18, and 20-32 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Some of the claims have been renumbered. In addition, new claims 33-35 have been added. Thus, claims 1-35 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,562,077 of Bobrow ("Bobrow"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-35 include limitations that are not disclosed by Bobrow. Specifically, independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:
extracting at least one visual feature from a document, the document having a plurality of pages;
ranking each of the pages in the document based on the at least one visual feature, wherein the ranking is performed based on a similarity relationship between content of the respective page and the at least one visual feature; and
displaying page icons representing the pages of the document in an order based on a result of the ranking.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes ranking each of the pages within a document based on at least one visual feature extracted from the document, where the ranking is performed based on a similarity relationship between content of the respective page and the visual feature, and displaying page icons representing the pages in an order based on a result of the ranking. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Bobrow.

Rather, Bobrow is related to a programming interface of a document search system that enables a user to dynamically specify features of the documents recorded in a corpus of documents. Specifically, Bobrow states:

“The document images are sorted by segmenting each document image recorded in the memory into a set of layout objects. Each layout object in the set of layout objects of each document is one of a plurality of layout object types, and each of the plurality of layout object types identify a structural element of a document image. A feature of a document is selected from a set of features, where each of the features in the set of features identify a selected group of layout objects in certain of the sets of layout objects recorded in the memory. A set of image segments is assembled in the memory. Each image segment in the set of image segments identifies those layout objects of a document image stored in the memory that form the selected feature. The assembled image segments are sorted into clusters in the memory, where each cluster defines a grouping of image segments that have similar layout objects forming the selected feature”

(Bobrow, Summary of the Invention)

Thus, it appears that Bobrow is related to sorting multiple documents (e.g., among multiple documents) based on a set of features. See, for example, Figs. 3 and 6 of Bobrow. In contrast, the present invention as claimed is related to managing multiple pages within the same document based on ranking of the visual feature of each page. There is no disclosure or suggestion within Bobrow to process pages within the same document. Even if Bobrow could be considered to process pages within the same document, Bobrow still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Bobrow.

Similarly, independent claims 12, 22, and 32 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 12, 22, and 32 are not anticipated by Bobrow.

Given that dependent claims 2-11, 13-21, 23-31, and 33-35 depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully

submitted that claims 2-11, 13-21, 23-31, and 33 are not anticipated by Bobrow. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.


Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date:

5/3/2004



Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300